

**REMARKS**

**Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)**

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of August 1, 2008 be extended one month, from November 1, 2008 to December 1, 2008.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-4364 and any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 21 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

**Claim Objections**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-3, 9-10, and 16-17 for various informalities. Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the claims.

**Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 103**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233581 to Reshef et al. ("Reshef") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,096,503 to Magdych et al. On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reshef in view of Magdych, and further in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art

(AAPA). On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3-6, 10-13 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reshef in view of Magdych, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064722 to Neeley et al. ("Neeley"). On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reshef in view of Magdych, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0236994 to Cedar et al. ("Cedar").

### **The Present Invention**

The present invention teaches a method and system for the automatic detection and correction of security vulnerabilities in both individual software components and across complex, multi-component software solutions. The present invention utilizes a plurality of vulnerability analysis and fortification tool (VAF) agents to analyze and proactively identify possible ways to attack a software component. Both legal (e.g., a registered user) and illegal (e.g., an unregistered user) interfaces are examined for vulnerabilities. Claim 1 recites "analyzing by a plurality of agents one or more software solutions to identify legal and illegal external interfaces thereto . . . wherein for each of said one or more software solutions, at least one separate agent is utilized. In other words, there is at least a one-to-one relationship wherein each software solution has a separate agent analyzing it. Similar amendments are made to independent claims 8 and 15.

The claims require at least a one-to-one relationship between a software solution begin monitored and an agent (" . . . wherein for each of said one or more software solutions, at least one separate agent is utilized.") Support for this claim language can be found on page 6, paragraph

[0011] of the application as filed. This allows independent use of agents in a distributed system scattered over multiple locations.

The Examiner asserts that Magdych teaches the claimed one-to-one relationship whereby each software solution is monitored by its own agent. This is incorrect. As is clear from reading Magdych, and in particular, the portions of Magdych cited by the Examiner, Magdych discloses a local *computer* having its own agent, not a separate agent for each *program* on the local computer. Applicant specifically claims a separate agent for each program, and neither Magdych nor any of the prior art teach or suggest the claimed one-to-one relationship.

None of the prior art, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests such a novel and non-obvious arrangement. In light of the foregoing arguments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

### Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

**PATENT**

**Application No. 10/795,776**

**Docket No. RSW20030219US1**

**Page 11**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-4364 and any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

December 1, 2008

Date

/Mark D. Simpson/

Mark D. Simpson

Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP

Centre Square West

1500 Market Street, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189

Telephone: 215 972 7880

Facsimile: 215 972 4169

Email: MSimpson@saul.com